

**REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 4, 2003. Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the application, with Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 8 being independent. Claims 1 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,628,974 to Lim in view of U.S. Patent 6,163,682 to Lee. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Between the references cited by the Examiner, U.S. Patent No. 6,163,682 to Lee is commonly owned with the subject matter of the present application by the same entity. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) states the following:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Lee qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)<sup>1</sup>, and is assigned to Samsung Electronics, Co. Ltd., the assignee of record in this application. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection is improper. Since Lim - the other reference cited by the Examiner – does not alone render any of independent Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 8 of the subject matter application unpatentable, Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8 and Claim 5 depending from Claim 4 are believed to be patentable.

It is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 4-8 be withdrawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. §102, in part, requires that “A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-(e) the invention was described in ... (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent...”

The Examiner objected to the drawing under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because step 512 illustrated in FIG. 5 is not mentioned in the specification. Description of this step has been added to the specification without introduction of any new matter.

It is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the specification because a keypad was incorrectly referenced on page 5, line 15. Care has been taken to correctly reference the key pad, as indicated by the corrected specification.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of the allowable subject matter found in Claims 2 and 3. These Claims depend from Claim 1, which is believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516